DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 482 938 CS 510 794

AUTHOR	Zhang, Liru
TITLE	Delaware Student Testing Program: Special Writing Study Report.
INSTITUTION	Delaware State Dept. of Education, Dover. Assessment and Accountability Branch.
PUB DATE	2000-11-00
NOTE	30p.; Prepared by the Assessment and Analysis Group. For a more detailed version of this report, see ED 455 271.
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.doe.state.de.us/.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Student Evaluation; Test Construction; Test Content; *Test Items; Test Validity; Test Wiseness; *Writing Achievement; *Writing Tests
IDENTIFIERS	*Delaware Student Testing Program

ABSTRACT

A study investigated possible reasons for the low performance in 2000 on the writing portion of the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) by students, especially in grades 3 and 5. The study also investigated ways to improve classroom instruction in writing. A panel of teachers reviewed the anchor papers and the process of testing. Panel members re-scored the anchor papers. A second panel of teachers participated in a re-scoring of a sample of 100 text-based student writings per grade (without using anchor papers). Panel members also discussed related issues in test administration, test development, scoring, and classroom instruction. Results include: (1) two text-based writing prompts should not be given on the same day; (2) instructions should be written to draw students' attention; (3) the new scores and the original scores on anchor papers were highly consistent in grades 3 and 5, and moderately high in grade 8 and grade 10; (4) passages should be engaging and the difficulty level should be consistent from year to year; (5) wording in the prompt should always direct students back to the text; (6) tenth grade teachers pointed out that most of the writing done by high school students is text-based, and that text-based writing is not a separate type of writing; (7) fifth grade teachers suggested that committees or teams develop questioning activities for teachers to use to improve students' performance on text-based writing; and (8) grade patterns for correlation coefficients were identified, with grade 3 being the lowest and grade 10 the highest. Changes planned for the Spring 2001 writing assessment include: the range for the total writing scores will be 1 to 15; two text-based writing tasks will be administered on different days; a prewriting sheet and scratch paper will be provided; and the text-based writing prompts will be formatted closer to the stand-alone prompts. Contains 6 tables of data. Appendixes contain the writing scoring rubric and a correlation matrix between reading and writing. (RS)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 482 938

Delaware Student Testing Program

Special Writing Study Report

Prepared by the Assessment and Analysis Group
Assessment and Accountability Branch
Delaware Department of Education

November 2000

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. Woodruff

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS 510 794

Officers of the Delaware Department of Education

State Board of Education

James L. Spartz, Ed. D., President
Jean W. Allen, Vice President
Mary B. Graham, Esquire
John W. Jardine, Jr.
Joseph A. Pika, Ph. D.
Dennis J. Savage
Claiboune D. Smith, Ph. D.

Valerie A. Woodruff
Secretary of Education
Jennifer W. Davis
Deputy Secretary of Education
David Blowman
Executive Assistant

Robin R. Taylor, M. Ed
Acting Associate Secretary, Assessment and Accountability Branch
Nancy J. Wilson, Ph. D.
Associate Secretary, Curriculum and Instructional Improvement Branch

Wendy B. Roberts, Ph. D.
Acting Director, Assessment and Analysis Group
Darlene J. Bolig, Ed. D.
Jeffery Fleming, M. S.
James F. Hertzog, M. Ed.
Nancy Maihoff, Ph. D.
Jon Manon, Ph. D.
Joann F. Prewitt, M. A.
Julie A. Schmidt, Ph. D.
Carole D. White, M. B. A.
Liru Zhang, Ph. D.

Qi Tao, Ph. D.
Technology Management and Design
Policy and Administrative Service Branch

Support Staff

Krista D. Holloway	Erin L. Pieshala
Barbara F. O'Neal	Kimberly K. Rodriguez

This Report was prepared by Liru Zhang.

The panel comments on Test Development in the section of results of the Study were summarized by Darlene Bolig.

The panel comments on Classroom Instruction in the section of results of the Study were summarized by Mike Kelley.

This report was reviewed and edited by Robin Taylor, Wendy Roberts, Darlene Bolig, and Mike Kelley.

Special Writing Study Report

Introduction

The objective of the Delaware Student Testing Program (DSTP) is to measure student progress toward the Delaware Content Standards. Each spring, all public school students in grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 take the statewide assessment in reading, writing, and mathematics. The writing assessment consists of a text-based writing task and a stand-alone writing prompt. The text-based writing task links to a passage in the DSTP reading assessment and students' responses to this task are scored twice, once for a reading score and once for a writing score. Both stand-alone and text-based writings are untimed. The stand-alone writing usually takes approximately 2 hours, including a pre-writing session, a first draft, and a final draft. Only the final draft of this prompt is scored.

A 5-point scoring rubric (Please see Attachment A) is used to score both the text-based and stand-alone responses. One reader scores the text-based writing; two readers score the stand-alone writing. The lowest score for the text-based writing is 1 and the highest possible score is 5; the lowest score for the stand-alone writing is 2 and the highest possible score is 10. The total writing raw score is the sum of the text-based writing score and the stand-alone writing score. Thus, the score range currently is from a low of 3 to a high of 15.

Over the past three years, the overall writing scores have declined in grades 3 and 5, remained steady in grade 8, and increased slightly in grade 10 (See Tables 1a -1d). The average performance on the stand-alone writing shows a consistent pattern of increase across years for students in grades 8 and 10; minor fluctuations over time for students in grades 3 and 5. Student performance on the text-based writing, however, dropped to the lowest level in 2000 for all grades except grade 10. Because of the drop in text-based writing scores, the Assessment and Analysis Group decided to conduct a special writing study to investigate the possible reasons for the low performance in 2000, especially in grades 3 and 5.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purposes of this study were (1) to investigate the possible reasons for the low performance on the text-based writing in 2000, especially in grades 3 and 5 and (2) to investigate ways to improve classroom instruction in writing.

Methods of the Study

General Design Due to the time constraints and the availability of information/data, this study focused on the following five aspects:

- Review the test process of testing (i.e., review of test administration and testing materials);

- Review text-based writing scores (i.e., review anchor papers and re-score a sample of students' responses to the text-based writing task);
- Examine construct validity evidence (i.e., review available data and conduct additional statistical analyses);
- Make recommendations for the development of text-based writing tasks; and
- Make recommendations on ways to improve classroom instruction in writing.

This study was conducted in two parts. In part one, a panel of teachers reviewed the anchor papers and the process of testing. Anchor papers are a sample of students' writings that are used as benchmarks in scoring and represent score points on the rubric. In this study, the panel members re-scored the anchor papers of a given grade independently and worked in a small group to discuss and finalize their scores. In part two, a second panel of teachers participated in re-scoring session for a sample of 100 text-based writings per grade. They scored students' writings holistically and analytically using the 5-point scoring rubric. Since the anchor papers were under review, the re-scoring was conducted without using anchor papers. Each writing sample was evaluated by up to 5 teachers. The panel members then discussed related issues in test administration, test development, scoring, and classroom instruction.

Sample of Student Writings A random sample of 100 student responses to the text-based writing task was selected from the population of each grade for re-scoring in this study.

Panels of Teachers Two panels of teachers were invited to participate in this study, one for anchor paper review and one for the re-scoring session. These teachers were selected based on their expertise in writing, teaching experience, experience in the development of writing assessment and scoring, familiarity with the Delaware Content Standards in English language arts and the writing scoring rubric, geographic location, and availability.

The Anchor Paper Review Panel consisted of 9 members. Seven of the panel members (78%) have served on the test development committees and 2 (22%) were involved in the anchor paper pulling for the 2000 DSTP writing assessment.

The Re-Scoring Panel included 22 members. Nearly half have served on the test development committees and about a quarter were involved in the anchor paper pulling for the 2000 DSTP writing assessment.

Data Analysis and Summary of Comments To investigate the possible reasons for the low performance on the text-based writing in 2000, teachers reviewed, discussed, and made recommendations for improving test administration, test development, scoring, and text-based writing instruction. These comments are reported in the "Results of the Study". The results of data analyses are presented in tables and charts. Data analyses for this study include:

- Three-year comparisons of statistics of writing scores by grade

- Correlation analysis of all types of writing scores and reading scores by grade for 2000 DSTP

Results of the Study

The results of the study are reported in five categories, test administration, re-scoring anchor papers, text-based writing development, text-based writing instruction, and construct validity evidence.

Test Administration Both panels reviewed the 2000 DSTP Directions for Administering the Test and test booklets and compared those directions with the previous years' testing materials and the process of testing. Suggestions for changes include:

1. Two text-based writing prompts, one for field test and one for operational test, should not be given on the same day, especially for younger students.
2. The text-based writing should be given in the beginning of the reading test rather than as the last item of the day.
3. The instructions for the text-based writing should be written to draw students' attention, such as bolded for emphasis, using separate pages to ensure that students understand this item will be scored twice for both reading and writing.
4. The text-based writing task should be formatted similar to the stand-alone writing prompt, such as using pre-writing.

Re-scoring Anchor Papers To examine the accuracy of scoring, the anchor papers were reviewed and re-scored by the first panel. The results of re-scoring anchor papers show that the new scores and the original scores are highly consistent in grades 3 and 5, and moderately high in grade 8 and grade 10.

Text-Based Writing Development During group discussions, teachers provided comments and suggestions related to the development of the text-based writing. Their comments focused on three major issues: passage selection, wording of the prompt, and use of the writing rubric.

- Passage Selection: Passages should be engaging and the difficulty level should be consistent from year to year. Third grade teachers preferred realistic stories as the basis for the text-based writing. Fifth grade teachers thought passages should be informative selections dealing with social studies or science.

- Wording of the Prompt: The wording in the prompt should always direct the students back to the text so that information from the text is included in the response. "Use details from the text to support your answer," should be in all prompts. Students should understand the concepts implied in the wording of the prompt. Developers should take care in using "user accessible" language in writing the prompts.

- Use of the Writing Rubric: Teachers discussed the possibility of adapting the general writing rubric so that each text-based writing item would have an item specific writing rubric. With guidelines provided in these item specific rubrics, it would be easier for scorers to determine when a student's writing is off topic.

Text-based Writing Instruction Teachers' comments related to instructional issues of the text-based writing focused on professional development in crafting text-based prompts and on identifying a variety of reading passages with which to write such prompts. They emphasized the need to have students write in response to a variety of text types (literary, informative, and technical) across content areas, and for teachers to model the process of making connections to the text and pulling out relevant details.

- Tenth grade teachers pointed out that most of the writing done by high school students is text-based, and that text-based writing is not a separate *type* of writing. Written responses to texts are produced as *forms* of persuasive, expressive, or informative writing. High school teachers also expressed a concern regarding block scheduling, where students may have only five weeks of instruction prior to the administration of the DSTP. Finally, tenth grade teachers suggested that high school English teachers have gone away from literary analysis in lieu of an emphasis on stand-alone writing prompts, which may sacrifice students' writing in response to text.

- Fifth grade teachers stressed the importance of students making connections with characters in a story. They suggested that grade-level teams or district committees (led by reading cadre representatives) develop questioning activities for teachers to use to improve students' performance on text-based writing. They also pointed out the need to release sample student responses to text-based writing prompts.

Construct Validity Evidence The statistics of the three writing scores, text-based, stand-alone, and the writing total raw scores are compared by grade for 1998, 1999, and 2000 (See Table 1).

As indicated earlier in this report, the text-based writing tasks attach to a passage in the DSTP reading assessment. This passage includes several multiple-choice (MC) and constructed-response (CR) items. The student's response to one of the CR items was scored as part of the reading score using the reading scoring rubric and the text-based writing score using the writing rubric.

Tables 2a and 2b present the correlation coefficients among five reading scores, three writing scores, and the SAT9 reading comprehension test scores by grade from the 2000 DSTP. The analyses are based on the following eight variables:

- MCITEM: The multiple-choice item score is the sum of scores on all MC items attached to the reading passage

- CRITEM: The constructed-response item score is the sum of scores on all constructed-response items attached to the reading passage
- PASSAGE: The passage score is the sum of scores on all MC and CR items attached to the reading passage
- IREADING: The reading item score is the score on the extended constructed-response item (the same item was scored for the text-based writing 'TEXT')
- TEXT: The text-based writing score is the score on the extended constructed-response item (the same item was scored for reading 'IREADING')
- PROMPT: The writing score on the stand-alone writing prompt
- WRITING: The total writing raw score that is the sum of the text-based and stand-alone writing scores
- READING: The DSTP reading score
- SAT9: The reading score on the 30-item SAT9 reading comprehension test

The results show that the correlation coefficients between the text-based writing scores (TEXT) and the item reading scores (IREADING) from the same CR items are .22 for grade 3, .45 for grade 5, .57 for grade 8, and .60 for grade 10. First, the statistics indicate a grade pattern, from the lowest value of the correlation coefficient in grade 3 to the highest value in grade 10. Second, the low correlation in grade 3 suggests that only 5% of the variance from one score associates with the other score; in grade 5, about 20% of the variance from one score associates with the other score. The correlations between the text-based writing scores (TEXT) and the scores on the MC items (MCITEM) and the CR items (CRITEM) from the reading passage, and the passage scores (PASSAGE) are .19, .31 and .31 in grade 3, which is the lowest among the four grades. Again, the low correlation in grade 3 suggests that only 4% to 10% of the variance of text-based writing scores is associated with the MC item scores, CR item scores, and the passage scores, respectively. Similarly, the correlations between the text-based writing score and the scores on MC items (MCITEM) and CR items (CRITEM) from the reading passage, and the score of the reading passage (PASSAGE) are .26 to .44 in grade 5, which indicate that 7% to 19% of the variance from the text-based writing scores can be accounted for by the scores from reading.

The correlations between the text-based writing (TEXT) and stand-alone writing score (PROMPT) range from .36, .41, .41, and .48 for grades 3, 5, 8, and 10, respectively. A grade pattern is observed, where the correlation coefficient for grade 3 is the lowest among the four grades. The low and moderately low correlations across grades suggest that about 13% to 23% of the variance from the text-based writing scores is associated with the stand-alone writing scores. Statistics appear to suggest that the text-based writing measures different types of writing skills or different constructs from the stand-alone writing.

The correlations between SAT9 reading scores and the DSTP reading scores (READING) are stable across grades, ranging from .84 to .86, and no grade pattern is found. Moreover, the sizes of the correlation coefficients between the SAT9 reading and the stand-alone writing scores (PROMPT) are very close, ranging from .41 to .48 across grades without a grade pattern. The correlations between the SAT9 reading and the text-

based writing scores (TEXT), however, show a grade pattern with the lowest coefficient in grade 3 (r=.33) and the highest coefficient in grades 8 and 10 (r=.48).

The correlation matrix among different types of writing and reading scores for the 1998 and 1999 DSTP provides additional information for the construct validity (See Attachment B). The correlation coefficients between reading and writing scores are consistent in 1998 and 1999. The correlations between text-based writing and reading scores are higher in 1998 and 1999 (r= .56 in 1998 and r=.60 in 1999 for grade 3; r=.60 in 1998 and r=.56 in 1999 for grade 5) than that in 2000 (r=.33 in grade 3; r=.44 in grade 5). In grade 3, the correlation between text-based and stand-alone writings is lower in 2000 (r=.36) than the previous years (r=.45 in 1998; r=.46 in 1999). The correlation between text-based writing and reading scores also shows the lowest value in 2000 for grade 3 (r=.63 in 1998; r=.68 in 1999; r=.53 in 2000). Such variations of the statistics across years of testing may be due to:

- Low generalization of writing scores across topics, the purposes of writing tasks, and occasions;
- Variations in the characteristics of the reading passages and attached items from year to year and from grade to grade; or
- Variations in writing skills among student populations from year to year.

Limitations of the Study

As indicated in the beginning of this report, the current study was designed and conducted based on the available data within a short period of time. Due to the limitations of the study, the author suggests caution in reviewing, interpreting, and using the results of this study.

- Information, such as sampling procedures and students' scores on the field test, is not available for review and additional analysis.
- Even though the sample of student text-based writings was randomly selected, the small sample size, only 1% of the grade population used in re-scoring, may not accurately reflect the characteristics of the population because of sampling errors. In addition, since the anchor papers were under review, the re-scoring process was conducted without using anchor papers.
- It is very important to note that previous studies (Moon et al, 1996; Fitzpatrick et al, 1994; Dunbar, Kortez, Hoover, 1991; Canton and Hoover, 1986) have shown that the generalization of writing performance is low across the purpose (or discourse) of writing tasks, writing topics, and occasions, especially when there are only a couple of items used in the writing assessment. In 2000, a new text-based writing task was introduced at each grade level, which may be one of the reasons for the fluctuation of the test scores. For example, third graders responded to an informative writing task instead of a persuasive writing task. Similarly, the fifth graders responded to an informative writing task in 1998 and 1999, but an expressive writing task in 2000. These changes could account for the low performance.

- An important issue of educational measurement is reliability. Reliability of performance-based assessment, such as writing, is often defined by agreement of readers in scoring a single task given on a single occasion, called inter-reader reliability or inter-reader consistency. However, another component of reliability involves the consistency of measurement over repeated occasions given fixed readers is called score reliability. Findings from early studies (Moon et al, 1996; Dunbar, Kortez, Hoover, 1991; Canton and Hoover, 1986) suggest that reader consistency differed considerably ranging from .33 to .91 and score reliability ranged from .26 to .60, which was dependent upon the number of points on the scoring scale, rating conditions, and changes in assessment programs (Dunbar et al, 1991; Fitzpatrick et al, 1994). The results of an experimental study conducted in Virginia (Moon et al, 1996) indicate that methods used for training and scoring (i.e., training readers to score multiple writing prompts at a single session or training readers to sequentially score writing prompts) impact both reliability and validity. They also found that readers scored differently using the same scoring method on the same set of students' papers across years. To better understand the nature of direct writing assessment and provide valid and reliable measures of student achievement, more research questions, such as the stability of scoring over time, the process of reader training and scoring, and score reliability across topics, discourses, and occasions, need to be further explored.

Conclusion

This study provides informative findings concerning student performance on direct writing assessment over time. The results of the statistical analysis help us better understand the characteristics of the text-based writing in large-scale assessment. Comments from the panels on test administration, scoring, and text-based writing development have been seriously reviewed and discussed by the Department of Education. The Text-Based Writing Subcommittee has recently made recommendations for the text-based writing assessment. As a result, the following changes are planned for the Spring 2001 writing assessment:

- The range for the total writing scores will be 1-15. The rules for calculating the total scores for the writing section of the DSTP will be changed to decrease the number of invalid total writing scores-if a student receives a valid score on either the stand-alone or text-based prompt, a total writing score will be reported for that student. Previously, a student received a total writing score only if both the writing prompts had valid scores.
- The two text-based writing tasks (one is for the field test) will be administered on different days.
- A Prewriting sheet and scratch paper will be available for students to use as they plan their response to the text-based writing prompts.
- The text-based writing prompts will be formatted closer to the stand-alone prompts (i.e., the text-based writing prompts will be presented in a "box").

In addition, recommendations regarding the future construction of text-based prompts based on this study will be discussed and operationalized by the test development committees – the committees responsible for writing the stand-alone prompts and the text-based writing tasks.

References

Moon, T. R., Loyd, B. H., Hughes, K. R. & Winter, P. (1996). Scoring and training issues involved in large-scale performance assessment.

Cantor, N. K. & Hoover, H. D. (1986). The reliability and validity of writing assessment: An investigation of rater, prompt within mode, and prompt between mode sources of error. Paper presented at the AERA Annual Conference, San Francisco, CA

Fitzpatrick, A. R., Ercikan, K., Yen, W. M. & Ferrara, S. (1994). The consistency between ratings collected in different test years. Paper presented at the NCME Annual Conference, New Orleans. LA

Dunbar, S. B., Kortez, D. M. & Hoover, H. D. (1991). Quality control in the development and use of performance assessment. Applied Measurement in Education. 4, 289-303.

State Summary Report -- Reading, Mathematics, Writing -- Spring 2000 Administration

State Summary Report in Writing -- 1998 DSTP

State Summary Report in Writing -- 1999 DSTP

State Summary Report in Writing -- 2000 DSTP

Table 1a

Comparisons of Writing Scores for 1998, 1999 and 2000 DSTP for Grade 3

GRADE 3	2000						1999						1998					
Writing	**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**		**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**		**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**	
Score	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
15																	1	0.0
14					2	0.0											3	0.0
13					3	0.0					11	0.1					12	0.2
12					12	0.1					39	0.5					53	0.7
11					31	0.4					93	1.2					152	2.0
10			4	0.0	116	1.5			5	0.1	269	3.5			6	0.1	463	6.2
9			5	0.0	359	4.7			17	0.2	719	9.4			36	0.5	928	12.4
8			88	1.1	911	12.1			61	0.8	1137	14.8			138	1.8	1190	15.8
7			261	3.4	1337	17.7			262	3.4	1477	19.2			438	5.8	1373	18.3
6			1447	19.2	1735	23.0			1149	14.9	1494	19.4			1740	23.2	1398	18.6
5	2	0.02	1729	23.0	1938	25.7	49	0.6	1801	23.4	1094	14.2	7	0.1	1523	20.3	1053	14.0
4	47	0.6	2737	36.4	643	8.5	387	5.0	2199	28.6	779	10.1	500	6.7	2353	31.3	520	6.9
3	550	7.31	762	10.1	430	5.7	2147	27.9	1170	15.2	576	7.5	2132	28.4	739	9.8	367	4.9
2	2641	35.1	4.84	6.4			3391	44.1	1024	13.3			2847	37.9	541	7.2		
1	4277	56.9					1714	22.3					2028	27.0				
Total	7517	100.0	7517	100.0	7517	100.0	7688	100.0	7688	100.0	7688	100.0	7514	100.0	7514	100.0	7514	100.0
Mean	1.52		4.54		6.06		2.18		4.26		6.44		2.15		4.70		6.85	
SD	0.66		1.27		1.63		0.85		1.40		1.94		0.90		1.41		1.98	
Purpose of Writing Task	Informative		Expressive				Persuasive		Informative				Persuasive		Expressive			

Table 1b

Comparisons of Writing Scores for 1998, 1999 and 2000 DSTP for Grade 5

GRADE 5	2000						1999						1998					
Writing	**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**		**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**		**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**	
Score	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
15					1	0.0											2	0
14					3	0.0					4	0.1					7	0.1
13					5	0.0					9	0.1					25	0.3
12					22	0.3					108	1.4					133	1.8
11					88	1.2					281	3.7					282	3.8
10			10	0.1	250	3.5			9	0.1	622	8.2			14	0.2	678	9.2
9			6	0.0	718	10.1			5	0.1	1402	18.4			32	0.4	1065	14.4
8			121	1.7	1405	19.8			349	4.6	1453	19.1			247	3.3	1208	16.3
7			398	5.6	1477	20.8			498	6.5	1294	17.0			518	7.0	1473	19.9
6			2424	34.2	1342	18.9			2573	33.8	1344	17.7			1682	22.7	1325	17.9
5	8	0.0	1528	21.5	1189	16.7	4	0.1	1384	18.2	794	10.4	8	0.1	1462	19.8	769	10.4
4	155	2.2	1898	26.7	374	5.2	624	8.2	2350	30.9	192	2.5	1205	16.3	2756	37.3	249	3.4
3	974	13.7	446	6.2	210	2.9	2761	36.3	278	3.7	105	1.4	2596	35.1	396	5.4	178	2.4
2	2958	41.8	252	3.5			2850	37.5	162	2.1			2365	32.0	287	3.9		
1	2988	42.2					1369	18					1220	16.5				
Total	7084	100.0	7084	100.0	7084	100.0	7608	100.0	7608	100.0	7608	100.0	7394	100.0	7394	100.0	7394	100.0
Mean	1.76		5.02		6.78		2.35		5.17		7.52		2.52		4.89		7.41	
SD	0.78		1.27		1.74		0.87		1.29		1.86		0.96		1.36		1.98	
Purpose of Writing Task	Expressive		Persuasive				Informative		Informative				Informative		Persuasive			

Table 1c

Comparisons of Writing Scores for 1998, 1999 and 2000 DSTP for Grade 8

GRADE 8	2000						1999						1998					
Writing	**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**		**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**		**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**	
Score	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
15					1	0.0					1	0.0						
14					1	0.0					5	0.1					10	0.1
13					6	0.0					10	0.1					33	0.4
12					22	0.2					78	1.0					205	2.6
11					102	1.3					184	2.4					497	6.3
10			7	0.0	353	4.5			8	0.1	572	7.3			208	0.2	763	9.9
9			5	0.0	948	12.3			25	0.3	1230	15.8			353	0.9	1309	16.5
8			220	2.8	2483	32.2			183	2.3	1757	22.5			1710	7.6	1514	19.1
7			761	9.8	1795	23.3			764	9.8	1531	19.6			1566	12.7	1266	16.0
6			3691	47.9	1070	13.9			2755	35.3	1228	15.8			2393	30.2	1152	14.5
5	1	0.01	1633	21.2	770	10.0	5	0.1	2006	25.7	825	10.6	2	0.0	1011	19.7	757	9.5
4	76	0.9	1204	15.6	108	1.4	360	4.6	1589	20.4	243	3.1	593	7.5	606	21.6	239	3.0
3	902	11.7	135	1.7	26	0.3	2069	26.5	303	3.9	130	1.7	2519	31.7	71	4.4	169	2.1
2	4254	55.3	34	0.4			3297	42.3	161	2.1			3255	41.0	16	2.6		
1	2457	31.9					2063	26.5					1565	19.7				
Total	7685	100.0	7685	100.0	7685	100.0	7794	100.0	7794	100.0	7794	100.0	7934	100.0	7934	100.0	7934	100.0
Mean	1.82		5.57		7.39		2.10		5.29		7.39		2.27		5.45		7.72	
SD	0.67		1.05		1.46		0.84		1.22		1.79		0.86		1.46		2.06	
Purpose of Writing Task	Expressive		Informative				Persuasive		Informative				Persuasive		Informative			

Table 1d

Comparisons of Writing Scores for 1998, 1999 and 2000 DSTP for Grade 10

GRADE 10	2000						1999						1998					
Writing	**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**		**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**		**Text-Based**		**Stand-Alone**		**Writing Total**	
Score	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**	**N**	**%**
15					1	0.0												
14					2	0.0												
13					9	0.1					11	0.2					1	0.0
12					76	1.1					29	0.4					16	0.2
11					189	2.7					170	2.5					113	1.7
10			6	0.0	427	6.1			422	0.1	362	5.4					321	4.8
9			10	0.1	970	14.0			568	0.2	780	11.6			1	0.0	848	12.6
8			267	3.8	1644	23.8			1948	3.1	1092	16.3			68	1.0	1185	17.6
7			628	9.1	1312	19.0			1314	8.6	1239	18.5			392	5.8	1248	18.6
6			2703	39.2	1126	16.3			1646	24.6	1265	18.9			1703	25.3	1508	22.4
5	10	0.1	1447	20.9	892	12.9			575	19.6	989	14.8			1426	21.2	1156	17.2
4	305	4.4	1548	22.4	156	2.2	115	1.7	207	29.1	453	6.8	295	4.4	2724	40.5	208	3.1
3	1268	18.3	183	2.6	90	1.3	1536	22.9	16	8.5	312	4.7	1687	25.1	271	4.0	120	1.8
2	3132	45.4	102	1.4			2903	43.3	6	6.3			2910	43.3	139	2.1		
1	2179	31.6					2148	32.1					1823	27.2				
Total	6894	100.0	6894	100.0	6894	100.0	6702	100.0	6702	100.0	6702	100.0	6724	100.0	6724	100.0	6724	100.0
Mean	1.96		5.38		7.34		1.94		4.87		6.82		2.07		4.85		6.92	
SD	0.83		1.21		1.77		0.78		1.45		1.95		0.83		1.15		1.71	
Purpose of Writing Task	Persuasive		Informative				Persuasive		Informative				Persuasive		Informative			

Table 2a

Correlation Matrix of DSTP Writing, DSTP Reading, and SAT9 Reading Scores by Grade

GRADE 3

	MCITEM	CRITEM	PASSAGE	IREADING	TEXT	PROMPT	WRITING	READING	SAT9
MCITEM	1.00	0.46	0.77	0.24	0.19	0.27	0.29	0.63	0.51
CRITEM		1.00	0.92	0.66	0.31	0.36	0.40	0.71	0.51
PASSAGE			1.00	0.58	0.31	0.38	0.42	0.78	0.59
IREADING				1.00	0.22	0.24	0.28	0.44	0.29
TEXT					1.00	0.36	0.69	0.37	0.28
PROMPT						1.00	0.93	0.50	0.43
WRITING							1.00	0.53	0.45
READING								1.00	0.88
SAT9									1.00

GRADE 5

	MCITEM	CRITEM	PASSAGE	IREADING	TEXT	PROMPT	WRITING	READING	SAT9
MCITEM	1.00	0.40	0.75	0.31	0.26	0.31	0.35	0.65	0.52
CRITEM		1.00	0.91	0.73	0.44	0.42	0.50	0.66	0.45
PASSAGE			1.00	0.67	0.44	0.45	0.52	0.77	0.56
IREADING				1.00	0.45	0.37	0.47	0.51	0.37
TEXT					1.00	0.41	0.75	0.44	0.33
PROMPT						1.00	0.91	0.50	0.41
WRITING							1.00	0.56	0.45
READING								1.00	0.86
SAT9									1.00

Table 2b

Correlation Matrix of DSTP Writing, DSTP Reading, and SAT9 Reading Scores by Grade

GRADE 8

	MCITEM	CRITEM	PASSAGE	IREADING	TEXT	PROMPT	WRITING	READING	SAT9
MCITEM	1.00	0.48	0.79	0.34	0.34	0.38	0.43	0.69	0.58
CRITEM		1.00	0.92	0.64	0.46	0.41	0.50	0.71	0.52
PASSAGE			1.00	0.61	0.47	0.46	0.54	0.81	0.63
IREADING				1.00	0.57	0.37	0.53	0.56	0.38
TEXT					1.00	0.41	0.75	0.52	0.39
PROMPT						1.00	0.91	0.55	0.48
WRITING							1.00	0.63	0.52
READING								1.00	0.85
SAT9									1.00

GRADE 10

	MCITEM	CRITEM	PASSAGE	IREADING	TEXT	PROMPT	WRITING	READING	SAT9
MCITEM	1.00	0.35	0.70	0.32	0.30	0.35	0.38	0.59	0.50
CRITEM		1.00	0.91	0.70	0.47	0.44	0.52	0.64	0.44
PASSAGE			1.00	0.67	0.49	0.49	0.56	0.74	0.55
IREADING				1.00	0.60	0.46	0.60	0.59	0.40
TEXT					1.00	0.48	0.80	0.54	0.39
PROMPT						1.00	0.91	0.59	0.48
WRITING							1.00	0.66	0.52
READING								1.00	0.84
SAT9									1.00

Attachment A
Writing Scoring Rubric

Delaware Student Testing Program - General Rubric for Writing

Delaware Student Testing Program – General Scoring Rubrics for Writing

The following characteristics determine the success of the response in meeting the needs of the audience and fulfilling the writing purpose.

Score of 5	Score of 4	Score of 3	Score of 2	Score of 1
Score point 5 meets all the criteria listed in score point 4. In addition, a paper receiving this score shows an exceptional awareness of readers' concerns and needs. The student may have shown an exceptional use of: • Development strategies specific to the purpose for writing • Distinctive style, voice, tone • Literary devices • Compositional risks	Unified with smooth transitions, a clear and logical progression of ideas, and an effective introduction and closing. Sufficient, specific, and relevant details that are fully elaborated. Consistently complete sentences with appropriate variety in length and structure. A consistent style with precise and vivid word choice. Few, if any, errors in standard written English that do not interfere with understanding.	Generally unified with some transitions, a clear progression of ideas, and an introduction and closing. Specific details but may be insufficient, irrelevant, or not fully elaborated. Generally complete sentences with sufficient variety in length and structure. Some style and generally precise word choice. Some errors in standard written English that rarely interfere with understanding.	Minimally unified and may lack transitions or an introduction or closing. Some specific details but may be insufficient, irrelevant, and/or not elaborated. Some sentence formation errors and a lack of sentence variety. Sometimes general and repetitive word choice. Several kinds of errors in standard written English that interfere with understanding.	Lacks unity. No or few specific details that are minimally elaborated. Frequent and severe sentence formation errors and/or a lack of sentence variety. Often general, repetitive, and/or confusing word choice. Frequent and severe errors in standard written English that interfere with understanding.

For non-scorable responses see below:

- Blank
- Off topic
- Written in a language other than
- Refusal
- Illegible
- Insufficient

/elp
5/10/99

Attachment B
Correlation Matrix
Between Reading and Writing

Correlation Matrix between Reading and Writing

1999	READING	TEXT-BASED	STAND-ALONE	WRITING
Grade 3				
READING	*1.00*			
TEXT-BASED	*0.60*	*1.00*		
STAND-ALONE	*0.57*	*0.45*	*1.00*	
WRITING TOTAL	*0.68*	*0.77*	*0.92*	*1.00*
Grade 5				
Reading	*1.00*			
Text-Based	*0.56*	*1.00*		
Prompt	*0.55*	*0.46*	*1.00*	
Writing	*0.64*	*0.79*	*0.91*	*1.00*
Grade 8				
Reading	*1.00*			
Text-Based	*0.65*	*1.00*		
Prompt	*0.55*	*0.49*	*1.00*	
Writing	*0.68*	*0.80*	*0.91*	*1.00*
Grade 10				
Reading	*1.00*			
Text-Based	*0.55*	*1.00*		
Prompt	*0.59*	*0.47*	*1.00*	
Writing	*0.66*	*0.75*	*0.92*	*1.00*
1998	**Reading**	**Text-B**	**Prompt**	**Writing**
Grade 3				
Reading	*1.00*			
Text-Based	*0.56*	*1.00*		
Prompt	*0.52*	*0.44*	*1.00*	
Writing	*0.63*	*0.77*	*0.91*	*1.00*
Grade 5				
Reading	*1.00*			
Text-Based	*0.60*	*1.00*		
Prompt	*0.57*	*0.45*	*1.00*	
Writing	*0.68*	*0.79*	*0.90*	*1.00*
Grade 8				
Reading	*1.00*			
Text-Based	*0.60*	*1.00*		
Prompt	*0.63*	*0.54*	*1.00*	
Writing	*0.70*	*0.80*	*0.94*	*1.00*
Grade 10				
Reading	*1.00*			
Text-Based	*0.56*	*1.00*		
Prompt	*0.56*	*0.47*	*1.00*	
Writing	*0.65*	*0.81*	*0.90*	*1.00*

* All correlation coefficients are calculated based on aggregated data.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

REPRODUCTION BASIS

☒ This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket) form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

☐ This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").